

PROGRAM CONSULTATION & COORDINATION/DNA CHECKLIST
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TUCSON FIELD OFFICE
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Office: TFO NEPA #:DOI - BLM - AZ- G020 - 2013 - 0011 - DNA
Project Name: Sloe Poke Well Pipeline
Case/Project No.: Empire Ranch grazing lease #6090
Location (legal description): T. 18 S. 17 E. Sec. 32, 31, 6
NLCS Unit: Las Cienegas NCA
Project Lead: Kristen Duarte

Technical Review:

Criteria Applies?	NAME	CRITERIA	SIGNATURE	DATE
Yes No				
(X) ()		(1) The new proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(2) A reasonable range of alternatives to the new proposed action was analyzed in the document being reviewed.	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(3) The information or circumstances upon which the document being reviewed are based are still valid and germane to the new proposed action.	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(4) The methodology and analytical approach used in the document being reviewed is appropriate for the new action.	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(5) The direct and indirect impacts of the new proposed action do not significantly differ from, or essentially the same as, those identified in the document being reviewed.	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(6) The new proposed action, if implemented, would not significantly change the cumulative impact analysis..	NEPA team	3/25/2013
(X) ()		(7) Public involvement in the document being reviewed provides suitable coverage for the new proposed action..	NEPA team	3/25/2013

Final Review:

Manager/Supervisor: /s/ Markian Rekshynskyj Date: 3/25/2013
Environmental Coordinator: /s/ Claire Crow Date: 3/25/2013

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA #:DOI - BLM - AZ- G020 - 2013 - 0011 - DNA

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No. 6090

Project Title/Type: Sloe Poke Well Pipeline

Location of Proposed Action: Las Cienegas NCA, Empire Grazing allotment North pasture

Description of the Proposed Action: A pipeline will be ran from North Well to Sloe Poke well in North Pasture on the Empire Ranch. The pipeline crosses about ¼ mile of BLM land and it will be placed within the existing footprint of an existing road. The pipeline is black poly material and will be buried 12-18 inches. Sloe Poke well is dry and has been for many years and by piping the water from North to Sloe Poke, the grazing lessee will be able to better distribute the cattle for grazing. See attached Map.

Applicant (if any): Grazing Lessee, Ian Tomlinson

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision

Date Approved July 25, 2003

LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____

Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because **it is specifically** provided for in the following LUP decisions:

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though **it is not specifically** provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Programmatic aquatic special status species reintroductions at Las Cienegas National Conservation Area EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 September 21, 2012

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the Environmental Assessment (EA) # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028, analyzed the placement of drinking troughs, drinkers and pipelines as part of the proposed action.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the alternatives considered in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 were appropriate for the current proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent lists of endangered species listing; updated BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the existing analysis is valid for the current proposed action, and new information on resource values and current circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the current proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, all impacts of the current proposed action are similar to those identified in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028. The proposed action will occur on an existing road which was previously analyzed.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, public involvement in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 included sending the grazing interested publics a copy of the EA and asking for comments. A 30-day comment period was given. Also, a grazing Proposed Decision was sent to the grazing interested publics for the proposed projects included in the EA. A 30- day protest period is included with the Proposed Decision. No protests were received.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Kristen Duarte	Rangeland Management Specialist	Tucson Field Office
Jeff Simms	Fisheries Biologist	Tucson Field Office
Amy Sobiech	Archaeologist	Tucson Field Office
Ben Lomeli	Hydrologist	Tucson Field Office
Catie Fenn	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Tucson Field Office
Markian Rekshynskyj	Manager, LCNCA	Tucson Field Office

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

CONCLUSION

☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/s/ Kristen L. Duarte
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Claire Crow
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Claire Crow
Signature of Responsible Official
Acting Field Manager

3/25/2013
Date

Note: The signed CONCLUSION on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:

/s/ Claire Crow
Acting Field Manager

3/25/2013
Date